arXiv:1607.00412v1 [cond-mat.supr-con] 1 Jul 2016

Evolution of superconducting gap anisotropy in hole-doped 122 iron pnictides

Christian Platt,[1,*] Gang Li,[2,†] Mario Fink,[3,‡] Werner Hanke,[3,§] and Ronny Thomale[3,¶]

[1] *Department of Physics, Stanford University, Stanford, CA 94305, USA*
[2] *Institute of Solid State Physics, Vienna University of Technology, A-1040 Vienna, Austria*
[3] *Institute for Theoretical Physics and Astrophysics, Julius-Maximilians University of Würzburg, Am Hubland, D-97074 Würzburg, Germany*

(Dated: July 5, 2016)

Motivated by recent experimental findings, we investigate the evolution of the superconducting gap anisotropy in 122 iron pnictides as a function of hole doping. Employing both a functional and a weak coupling renormalization group approach (FRG and WRG), we analyse the Fermi surface instabilities of an effective 122 model band structure at different hole dopings x, and derive the gap anisotropy from the leading superconducting instability. In the transition regime from collinear magnetism to $s_\pm$-wave, where strong correlations are present, we employ FRG to identify a non-monotonous change of the gap anisotropy in qualitative agreement with new experimental findings. From the WRG, which is asymptotically exact in the weak coupling limit, we find an $s_\pm$-wave to d-wave transition as a function of hole doping, complementing previous findings from FRG [Thomale et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. **107**, 117001 (2011)]. The gap anisotropy of the $s_\pm$-wave monotonously increases towards the transition to d-wave as a function of x.

PACS numbers: 74.20.Mn, 74.20.Rp, 74.25.Jb

Introduction. The iron pnictides have established a new arena of high-temperature superconductors with a remarkable variety of structural and chemical material compositions [1–5]. Among them, the $BaFe_2As_2$ (Ba-122) parent compound has received particular attention due to its crystal quality and amenability to chemical substitution. A T_c up to 38 K at optimal doping $x \sim 0.4$ has been accomplished in Ba-122 [6] by replacing Ba^{2+} with K^+ of similar atomic radius to give $K_xBa_{1-x}Fe_2As_2$ (KBa-122). As for moderately doped KBa-122 and most other pnictide families, experimental evidence combined with theoretical modelling tends to be consistent with an extended s-wave ($s_\pm$-wave) superconducting state [7] driven by electronic correlations. Here, the superconducting gap function takes opposite signs on hole pockets located at Γ and M versus electron pockets at X and X' in the unfolded Brillouin zone with one Fe atom per unit cell. (The existence of an M hole Fermi pocket is one of the few both significant and non-universal features of iron pnictide materials. If present as for KBa-122, it is vital to understanding the fundamental character of the superconducting state [8].) While the $s_\pm$ state still resides in the A_{1g} lattice representation and as such cannot be distinguished from a trivial s-wave in this respect, the sign change between electron and hole pockets allows to take advantage of collinear $(\pi, 0)/(0, \pi)$ spin fluctuations as a central driver for superconductivity [9–11].

In the strong hole doping limit of KBa-122, there is conflicting experimental evidence suggesting a d-wave superconducting order parameter. While penetration depth [12] and nuclear quadrupole resonance [13] measurements only hint at a nodal superconducting state which could also imply a nodal $s_\pm$ state, evidence in favor of d-wave has been deduced from thermal conductivity [14, 15]. The enhanced experimental interest was preceded by the theoretical proposal of an extended d-wave ($d_\pm$-wave) state [16] for strongly hole doped pnictides and a concise material prediction of a $d_\pm$-wave state for KBa-122 [17]. Specific heat measurements in K-122 [18, 19] and heat transport in $RbFe_2As_2$ [20] show signatures of a nodal gap that, upon pressure, undergoes a phase transition into a nodeless gap [21]. Contrasting the thermal conductivity profile against K-122, optimally doped KBa-122 as a candidate for hosting a nodeless $s_\pm$-wave state and the 1111 pnictide LaFePO as a candidate for an accidentally nodal $s_\pm$ state [22, 23] show strikingly different transport behaviour [24]. This supports the unique, possibly d-wave character of superconductivity in K-122, while a recent thermal transport study is challenging previous interpretations in favor of protected gap nodes in K-122 [25]. Additionally, recent penetration depth experiments are interpreted in favor of an $s_\pm$-wave state for arbitrary hole doping [26], while a d-wave state could in principle hardly be distinguished from a nodal $s_\pm$-wave state for large hole doping. Moreover, heat capacity and thermal expansion experiments appear to suggest the absence of nodes in the superconducting state even for large hole doping [27]. As another possible objection against d-wave in strongly hole doped KBa-122, findings from laser ARPES seem to rule out nodes on the hole pockets [28, 29]. (A particular type of nodal s-wave solution preferred by interactions of small momentum scattering would be consistent with this observation [30], while the fragility of the SC phase against disorder speaks against an s-wave state [15].) Furthermore, a vortex lattice analysis questions the existence of any vertical line nodes, which would be a shared feature of both nodal $s_\pm$-wave and d-wave order [31].

Together with the question of $s_\pm$-wave vs. d-wave for strong hole doping, recent heat transport revived the in-

terest in the momentum dependence of the superconducting gap in the underdoped regime [32]. The ratio of residual thermal resistivity in the superconducting and the normal state allows to resolve the change of density in the low-energy thermal transport regime which, by assuming an only slowly changing gap amplitude, correlates with the degree of gap anisotropy. From an experimental perspective, ARPES sometimes allows to resolve some k-dependence of the superconducting gap along the Fermi surface, while the decreased accuracy for large k as well as disorder is mostly preventing a detailed resolution of e.g. the electron pocket gaps in the pnictides. In principle, STM is an ideal method to resolve the momentum dependence of the gap. For pnictides such as LiFeAs which cleave at an electrically neutral surface, this provided a detailed resolution of the gap function [33], showing LiFeAs to be of moderately anisotropic s-wave type. (Astonishingly, in part due to the absence of magnetic order, LiFeAs was one the most difficult pnictides to be analysed in theory, and only at a comparatively late stage was found to host an $s_\pm$ state [34].) Since 122 pnictides do not cleave at a neutral plane and early ARPES data did not observe detailed gap modulation in KBa-122 [35], one had to resort to integrated measures of the gap function such as by thermal Hall [8] or thermal conductivity [36], from the beginning.

In this article, we analyse the evolution of superconducting gap anisotropy in hole-doped KBa-122. Employing both a functional and a weak coupling renormalization group study (FRG [37, 38] and WRG [39, 40]), we compute the momentum dependence of the gap function, starting from the coexistence phase with collinear magnetism around half filling up to K-122 at maximum hole doping. Around half filling, where the degree of correlations is relatively high, FRG appears as a better choice than e.g. the random phase approximation (RPA) to resolve the interdependencies of the particle-hole and particle-particle parquet channels. In line with recent experiments [32], we find a non-monotonous evolution of the gap anisotropy which, as a function of hole doping, reaches a minimum in the superconducting phase from which on the gap keeps increasing (Fig. 1). In the strong hole doping regime, we employ WRG which provides analytically exact results in the limit of infinitesimal interactions. In qualitative agreement with previous FRG studies [17], we find a transition from $s_\pm$-wave to $d_\pm$-wave [16], which allows us to study the $s_\pm$ gap anisotropy evolution as we approach the transition point (Fig. 2).

Superconducting gap function. In order to investigate the competing orders of $Ba_{1-x}K_xFe_2As_2$, we start out from a five iron d-orbital description obtained by Graser *et al.* [41] for the undoped parent compound. (Note that the FRG was previously extended to additionally include the As p-bands [42], and found an, in principle, similar result to the effective 5-band description.) The corresponding tight-binding model is given by

$$H_0 = \sum_{\mathbf{k},s} \sum_{a,b} c^\dagger_{\mathbf{k}as} K_{ab}(\mathbf{k}) c_{\mathbf{k}bs}, \tag{1}$$

with $\mathbf{k}$, (a,b), s denoting momentum, orbital, and spin degrees of freedom and K_{ab} standing for the orbital matrix element . Except for certain minor details, the full *ab-initio* band structure for $BaFe_2As_2$ at low energies is accurately reproduced by this five orbital description [41]. The different doping levels, however, are only modeled by a rigid band shift plus mass renormalization, which for $x = 0.5$ potassium replacement amounts to $0.1eV$, roughly 2.5% of the bandwidth. The filling is thereby given by $n = 6.0 - x/2$ electrons per iron atom. In order to provide a quantitatively accurate doping evolution in such a band structure, it would be necessary to go beyond such a rigid band approximation. Instead, we take on a qualitative view in the following, and concentrate on the two important transition regimes as a function of hole doping, i.e. from collinear magnetism to $s_\pm$-wave for the underdoped case and from $s_\pm$-wave to $d_\pm$-wave, which might be experimentally observed for the overdoped case [43].

For the interaction part H_{int}, we use a complete set of onsite intra- and inter-orbital Coulomb repulsion as well as Hund's rule and pair-hopping terms

$$H_{\text{int}} = \sum_i \Bigg[U_{\text{intra}} \sum_a n_{ia\uparrow} n_{ia\downarrow} + U_{\text{inter}} \sum_{a<b,ss'} n_{ias} n_{ibs} - J_{\text{H}} \sum_{a<b} \vec{S}_{ia} \vec{S}_{ib} + J_{\text{pair}} \sum_{a<b} c^\dagger_{ia\uparrow} c^\dagger_{ia\downarrow} c_{ib\downarrow} c_{ib\uparrow} \Bigg] \tag{2}$$

with $U_{\text{intra}} = 4.0eV$, $U_{\text{inter}} = 2.0eV$, and $J_{\text{H}} = J_{\text{pair}} = 0.7eV$ [44, 45]. Both the functional RG and the weak-coupling RG provide an effective low-energy theory H^Λ which reveals a hierarchy of favoured Fermi surface instabilities in all channels. (Note that only the relative and not the absolute strengths of the interaction terms matter for WRG, in which the absolute scale is taken to the infinitesimal limit.) Referring to the literature for more details on the methodology (for a review on multi-orbital FRG see [38], for the WRG see [40, 46]), for the subsequent discussion of the superconducting gap anisotropy, it is only relevant to appreciate that FRG and WRG adopt an appropriate band basis $\gamma^\dagger_k$, γ_k that diagonalizes the quadratic part of the Hamiltonian. (The label k comprises momentum, band, and spin degrees of freedom.) The renormalized interaction in this basis yields

$$H^\Lambda_{\text{int}} = \sum_{k_1,\ldots,k_4} V^\Lambda(k_1,k_2,k_3,k_4) \gamma^\dagger_{k_1} \gamma^\dagger_{k_2} \gamma_{k_3} \gamma_{k_4}. \tag{3}$$

Let us particularize to the superconducting channel. The irreducible lattice representations along with relative angular momentum of the superconducting condensate allow to distinguish the different superconducting orders.



FIG. 1. (Color online) Evolution of $s_\pm$-wave gap anisotropy computed from FRG in the vicinity of the magnetic phase. x_r parametrizes the relative hole doping with respect to the center of the $(\pi,0)/(0,\pi)$ collinear magnetic domain. Starting from $x_\mathrm{r} < 0.05$ where $s_\pm$-wave is still a subleading instability, the gap anisotropy P which by Eq. 6 is the integrated square of the gap anisotropy κ defined in Eq. 5 first decreases as a function of x_r, and then increases again deeper in the superconducting phase. This feature can be reconciled by a changing orbital-sensitive balance of competing scattering channels $\Gamma \leftrightarrow X$ and $M \leftrightarrow X$ vs. $X \leftrightarrow X'$ as a function of x_r.

We decompose the pairing channel into eigenmodes

$$\sum_i \oint_{FS_i} \frac{d\hat{q}}{(2\pi)v_F(q)} V^\Lambda(q,-q,k,-k) g_l(q) = \lambda_l g_l(k). \quad (4)$$

Here, $\sum_i \oint_{FS_i} d\hat{q}$ denotes the integration along all Fermi-surface sheets, $v_F(q)$ the Fermi velocity, and l the running index over the different eigenmodes and their corresponding eigenvectors $g_l(k)$. Eq. (4) is form invariant to the linearized BCS gap equation. Negative eigenvalues λ_l signal a superconducting instability. In weak coupling, the λ_l convert into a $T_c^l \sim \exp(-1/(N_\mathrm{F}|\lambda_l|))$, where N_F denotes the density of states at the Fermi level, i.e. the most negative $\lambda_{l^*} \equiv \lambda_1$ is the dominant superconducting instability.

It is the gap form factor $g_1(k)$ that hosts the information about the momentum dependence of the superconducting gap. To create a local measure $\kappa_i(k)$ for the gap anisotropy, we consider the deviation of $g_1(k)$ with respect to its mean on the respective Fermi-surface sheet

$$\kappa_i(k) = g_1(k) - \oint_{FS_i} \frac{d\hat{q}}{2\pi} g_1(q), \quad (5)$$

where i denotes a running index over individual pockets. Note that κ is defined as the gap eigenvector $g_1(k)$ subtracted by its pocket average, and as such takes positive and negative values even for an s-wave eigenvector. The integrated square of $\kappa_i(k)$

$$P = \sum_i \oint_{FS_i} \frac{d\hat{q}}{2\pi} \kappa_i(q)^2, \quad (6)$$

then gives a reasonable measure for the total gap anisotropy.

Gap anisotropy in the underdoped regime. Within FRG, one finds a second-order phase transition from a collinear $Q = (\pi,0)/(0,\pi)$ spin density wave instability to an $s_\pm$ superconducting instability in the underdoped regime. The SDW form factor is nodal [47], mainly reflecting the change of d_{xz} and d_{yz} orbital weight on electron and hole pockets.

What is experimentally perceived as the coexistence regime of magnetism and superconductivity is reconciled in FRG by the domain where the leading eigenvalue in the pairing channel λ^SC is smaller, but in close proximity to the leading eigenvalue in the magnetic (i.e. crossed particle-hole) channel λ^SDW. As opposed to RPA approaches, where a systematic discussion of sub-leading instabilities in different parquet channels is impossible due to the lack of vertex corrections between different channels, the FRG allows us to analyze the dominant subleading superconducting state at the onset of SDW order.

Fig. 1 defines a relative doping level x_r where $x_\mathrm{r} = 0$ is the center of the SDW regime. Plotting $P(x_\mathrm{r})$ reveals a reduction of gap anisotropy setting in already in the SDW-dominated regime and continuing to the $s_\pm$-wave regime. The main change of gap anisotropy κ is observed for the electron pockets. Starting from $x_\mathrm{r} = 0$, the background of SDW order naturally explains an enhanced tendency for gap anisotropy and its reduction as we are leaving the SDW regime for $x_\mathrm{r} > 0$. This trend matches the experimental observation [32].

In related theoretical works, it was shown that gap nodes in the superconductor can be imposed due to antiferromagnetism [48, 49]. Intuitively, this is found by assuming a mean field description of the background SDW order and by considering the onset of superconductivity for the reconstructed Fermi surface [46]. Assuming a scenario dominated by intra-orbital interactions, the gap anisotropy evolution as a function of hole doping can be understood by analyzing the orbital-sensitive scattering channels between hole and electron pockets according to $\Gamma \leftrightarrow X/X'$ and $M \leftrightarrow X/X'$ vs. the electron-

electron pocket scattering along $X \leftrightarrow X'$. In general, the $X \leftrightarrow X'$ scattering enhances the electron anisotropy in order to minimize the energy penalty from repulsive interactions. By contrast, the $\Gamma \leftrightarrow X/X'$ scattering also induces anisotropy inherited from the change of d_{xz}/d_{yz} orbital content along the Fermi surface, but tends to drive a homogenous gap on X/X' for connected Fermi surface pieces of equal orbital content [23, 50]. This competition is not particularly modified for a small change of x_r. The crucial effect derives from the change of d_{xy} orbital content of the electron pockets as a function of hole doping, and, as such, the relevance of $M \leftrightarrow X/X'$ scattering from the M hole pockets which is of solely d_{xy} orbital content. As the electron pockets shrink due to hole doping, their range of d_{xy} orbital content is reduced and concentrates on a small Fermi surface slice centered around the $\Gamma - X/X'$ front tips of the electron pockets [23]. This evolution eventually even yields an inversion of the electron pocket anisotropy which can be observed in Fig. 1 for $x_\mathrm{r} = 0.32$. The general trend for the overall gap anisotropy P, however, stays monotonous in this regime of x_r.

Gap anisotropy at the s-wave to d-wave transition. Guided by recent experimental evidence [43], a transition from s-wave to d-wave in KBa-122 may occur in the strong hole doping regime. Note that while self-energy effects seem to be less important for strong hole doping, mass renormalization appears to become even more significant, and that spin fluctuations, even though incommensurate, might persist further in hole-doped than electron-doped 122 compounds [51]. This is consistent with the finding from correlation-induced mass enhancements [52], a claimed improvement of experimental evidence and theoretical modelling through a DMFT+DFT analysis [53, 54], and a detailed ARPES analysis at optimal doping [55]. (Recently, the enlarged density of states close but not at the Fermi level has also been suggested to explain the enhancement of correlations in K-122 [56]). From NMR, strong spin and charge fluctuations in K-122 are found close to criticality [57].) Early ARPES data for K-122 found only hole pockets present [58], as confirmed by de Haas van Alphen measurements [59]. More recent ARPES data for $x = 0.9$ [60] identified an according Lifshitz transition to occur around $x = 0.7 - 0.9$, which from density functional theory has been located at $x \sim 0.9$ [61]. The dominant hole pocket at M (in the unfolded zone) motivated previous FRG studies to predict d-wave in K-122 at an early stage [17]. As a general tendency, which was also confirmed by later RPA studies [62], the propensity of forming d-wave should become increasingly competitive to s-wave as a function of hole doping, a notion which recently is also confirmed by Raman spectroscopy [63, 64].

In order to adopt an approach for this question of d-wave in KBa-122, which is analytically exact in the weak coupling limit, we have expanded the original WRG to a multi-band / multi-pocket scenario with orbital-sensitive interactions according to Eq. (2). We indeed find a phase transition from $s_\pm$-wave to $d_\pm$-wave superconductivity. The precise doping where the transition occurs, however, sensitively depends on the details of the interactions and Fermiology, and occurs at lower hole doping than the experimentally promising region. This is not surprising. First, the limit of infinitesimal interactions oversimplifies the degree to which the spin fluctuations are able to affect the superconducting pairing by only considering diagrams quadratic in the Hubbard scale U. Second, disorder present in the measured samples could significantly modify the competition of s vs d-wave where, for example, an accidentally nodal $s_\pm$-wave state can be rendered gapped [65].

Nevertheless, we wish to investigate on analytically controlled footing how the $s_\pm$-wave gap anisotropy evolves in proximity to the s/d-wave phase transition. For the given relative interaction strengths described below Eq. (2), we employ x_r as a relative hole doping parameter where $x_\mathrm{r} = 0$ defines the s/d-wave phase transition. The evolution graph of $\lambda_{s_\pm}$ vs. $\lambda_{d_\pm}$ is depicted in Fig. 2, along with the monotonously increasing gap anisotropy $P(x_\mathrm{r})$ which is particularly steeply increasing in immediate vicinity of $x_\mathrm{r} = 0$. The strongest change in κ is observed for the electron pockets while the hole pocket anisotropy (shaded grey) is hardly changed. The electron pocket gap anisotropy in the gapped $s_\pm$-wave phase (the $s_\pm$-wave nodal lines marked by straight thin lines do not intersect the Fermi pockets) increases until the transition occurs into the $d_\pm$-wave state. As predicted in [16], this state features $d_{x^2-y^2}$-wave type sign changes on individual pockets along with an additional sign change from hole to electron pockets, rendering the leading harmonic contribution to be $\Delta_{d_\pm}(\boldsymbol{k}) \sim \cos(2k_x) - \cos(2k_y)$.
Similar to s-wave vs $s_\pm$-wave, the irreducible lattice representation for both $d_{x^2-y^2}$-wave and $d_\pm$-wave is always B_{1g}. While $d_{x^2-y^2}$-wave and $d_\pm$-wave would in principle be viable candidates for unconventional superconducting instabilities at weak coupling, we have never observed a leading $d_{x^2-y^2}$-wave in our investigations of KBa-122. Note, that in comparison to the FRG result, where the driving mechanism for d-wave was the intra-pocket scattering around M, the $X \leftrightarrow X'$ alone seems to be strong enough for infinitesimal coupling to make $d_\pm$-wave become favorable over $s_\pm$-wave.
The universal enhancement of the $s_\pm$ gap anisotropy at the transition to $d_\pm$ is a relevant observation in terms of the possible stabilization of an $s + id$-wave superconducting state in the iron pnictides. The $s + id$-wave state has been analyzed from Ginzburg-Landau theory [66] and was microscopically predicted to emerge in iron pnictides [67, 68]. The central driver for such a non-chiral superconducting state, which still breaks time-reversal symmetry and D_4 lattice symmetry, is the maximisation



FIG. 2. (Color online) Evolution of the superconducting gap anisotropy computed from WRG in the vicinity of the $s_\pm$-wave to d-wave phase transition. x_r parametrizes the relative hole doping with respect to the transition point. The attractive SC eigenvalue λ_d (green straight line) eventually moves below $\lambda_{s_\pm}$ (green dashed line) as a function of hole doping. Approaching the transition from the $s_\pm$ side ($x_r < 0$), the Fermi surface-resolved gap anisotropy κ predominantly changes on the electron pockets (coloured) while the gap anisotropy on the hole pockets (grey) stays unchanged. The total $s_\pm$-wave gap anisotropy P increases monotonously, and particularly steeply close to the d-wave transition. We find an extended d-wave state with no sign change between Γ and M hole pockets, in line with previous calculations from FRG [16, 17]. Beyond the transition, the extended d-wave state trivially maximizes the gap anisotropy for a given gap amplitude.

of condensation energy. Now, having a close-to-nodal $s_\pm$-wave gap and a symmetry-protected nodal d-wave gap at the s/d-wave transition in the pnictides, yields a strong condensation energy gain both by removing the d-wave nodes and by reducing the $s_\pm$ gap anisotropy. This would make $s+id$-wave particularly favorable energetically. Another s-wave state with unequal hole pocket signs was proposed to induce a time-reversal symmetry breaking $s + is$ state [69]. From WRG, we have not found an indication for this formation so far.

Conclusion. We have analysed the evolution of the superconducting gap for the hole-doped KBa-122 iron pnictides. In the underdoped regime, our FRG analysis qualitatively reproduces the experimental finding of an enhanced gap anisotropy in the proximity to collinear magnetism. This anisotropy first decreases and then monotonously increases as a function of deeper hole doping into the $s_\pm$-wave phase. For the analytically controlled limit of infinitesimal interactions, our weak coupling RG analysis gives an $s_\pm$-wave to $d_\pm$-wave transition, which might relate to the experimental regime of strong hole-doping regime around K-122. The $s_\pm$-wave universally increases monotonously towards the transition, and as such provides support for the possible formation of an $s + id$-wave state in the transition regime. From a broader perspective, it would be interesting to apply our approach to electron-doped pnictides as well. In addition, isovalent P-doping, implying an energy shift of the hole pocket at the M point [23], might crucially change the scenario from one studied here. Experimentally, the degree of anisotropy for the P-doped 122 family was found to be enhanced [70, 71], which, in absence of the M hole pocket, is consistent with our analysis of the $s_\pm$-wave gap anisotropy.

Acknowledgments. We thank A. V. Chubukov and D. Scalapino for discussions. We thank R. Prozorov and L. Taillefer for helpful comments, and I. I. Mazin for a careful reading of the manuscript. The work was supported by the DFG (Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft) through the focus program DFG-SPP 1458 on iron-based superconductors. W. H. and R. T. acknowledge support by the ERC (European Research Council) through ERC-StG-TOPOLECTRICS-Thomale-336012. R.T. was supported by DFG-SFB 1170. CP was supported by the Leopoldina Fellowship Programme LPDS 2014-04.

* chplatt@stanford.edu
† li@ifp.tuwien.ac.at
‡ mario.fink@physik.uni-wuerzburg.de
§ hanke@physik.uni-wuerzburg.de
¶ rthomale@physik.uni-wuerzburg.de

[1] Y. Kamihara, T. Watanabe, M. Hirano, and H. Hosono, J. Am. Chem. Soc. **130**, 3296 (2008).
[2] I. I. Mazin, Nature **464**, 183 (2010).
[3] G. R. Stewart, Rev. Mod. Phys. **83**, 1589 (2011).
[4] F. Wang and D.-H. Lee, Science **332**, 200 (2011).
[5] A. Chubukov and P. J. Hirschfeld, Physics Today **68**, 46 (2015).
[6] M. Rotter, M. Tegel, and D. Johrendt, Phys. Rev. Lett. **101**, 107006 (2008).
[7] I. I. Mazin, D. J. Singh, M. D. Johannes, and M. H. Du, Phys. Rev. Lett. **101**, 057003 (2008).
[8] J. G. Checkelsky *et al.*, Phys. Rev. B **86**, 180502 (2012).
[9] D. J. Scalapino, Rev. Mod. Phys. **84**, 1383 (2012).
[10] A. V. Chubukov, D. V. Efremov, and I. Eremin, Phys. Rev. B **78**, 134512 (2008).
[11] K. Kuroki *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **101**, 087004 (2008).
[12] K. Hashimoto *et al.*, Phys. Rev. B **82**, 014526 (2010).
[13] H. Fukazawa *et al.*, Journal of the Physical Society of Japan **78**, 083712 (2009).
[14] J. K. Dong *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **104**, 087005 (2010).

[15] J.-P. Reid *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **109**, 087001 (2012).
[16] R. Thomale, C. Platt, J. Hu, C. Honerkamp, and B. A. Bernevig, Phys. Rev. B **80**, 180505 (2009).
[17] R. Thomale, C. Platt, W. Hanke, J. Hu, and B. A. Bernevig, Phys. Rev. Lett. **107**, 117001 (2011).
[18] F. F. Tafti *et al.*, Nat. Phys. **9**, 349 (2013).
[19] M. Abdel-Hafiez *et al.*, Phys. Rev. B **87**, 180507 (2013).
[20] Z. Zhang *et al.*, Phys. Rev. B **91**, 024502 (2015).
[21] F. F. Tafti *et al.*, Phys. Rev. B **91**, 054511 (2015).
[22] K. Kuroki, H. Usui, S. Onari, R. Arita, and H. Aoki, Phys. Rev. B **79**, 224511 (2009).
[23] R. Thomale, C. Platt, W. Hanke, and B. A. Bernevig, Phys. Rev. Lett. **106**, 187003 (2011).
[24] J.-P. Reid *et al.*, Superconductor Science and Technology **25**, 084013 (2012).
[25] H. Xiao-Chen *et al.*, Chinese Physics Letters **32**, 127403 (2015).
[26] K. Cho *et al.*, arXiv:1605.04183.
[27] F. Hardy *et al.*, arXiv:1605.05485.
[28] T. Shimojima *et al.*, Science **332**, 564 (2011).
[29] Y. Ota *et al.*, Phys. Rev. B **89**, 081103 (2014).
[30] S. Maiti, M. M. Korshunov, and A. V. Chubukov, Phys. Rev. B **85**, 014511 (2012).
[31] H. Kawano-Furukawa *et al.*, Phys. Rev. B **84**, 024507 (2011).
[32] J.-P. Reid *et al.*, arXiv:1602.03914.
[33] M. P. Allan *et al.*, Science **336**, 563 (2012).
[34] C. Platt, R. Thomale, and W. Hanke, Phys. Rev. B **84**, 235121 (2011).
[35] K. Nakayama *et al.*, EPL (Europhysics Letters) **85**, 67002 (2009).
[36] X. G. Luo *et al.*, Phys. Rev. B **80**, 140503 (2009).
[37] W. Metzner, M. Salmhofer, C. Honerkamp, V. Meden, and K. Schönhammer, Rev. Mod. Phys. **84**, 299 (2012).
[38] C. Platt, W. Hanke, and R. Thomale, Advances in Physics **62**, 453 (2013).
[39] W. Kohn and J. M. Luttinger, Phys. Rev. Lett. **15**, 524 (1965).
[40] S. Raghu, S. A. Kivelson, and D. J. Scalapino, Phys. Rev. B **81**, 224505 (2010).
[41] S. Graser *et al.*, Phys. Rev. B **81**, 214503 (2010).
[42] J. Lichtenstein *et al.*, Phys. Rev. B **89**, 214514 (2014).
[43] T. Böhm *et al.*, (unpublished) .
[44] T. Miyake, K. Nakamura, R. Arita, and M. Imada, Journal of the Physical Society of Japan **79**, 044705 (2010).
[45] P. Werner *et al.*, Nat Phys **8**, 331 (2012).
[46] W. Cho, R. Thomale, S. Raghu, and S. A. Kivelson, Phys. Rev. B **88**, 064505 (2013).
[47] Y. Ran, F. Wang, H. Zhai, A. Vishwanath, and D.-H. Lee, Phys. Rev. B **79**, 014505 (2009).
[48] D. Parker, M. G. Vavilov, A. V. Chubukov, and I. I. Mazin, Phys. Rev. B **80**, 100508 (2009).
[49] S. Maiti, R. M. Fernandes, and A. V. Chubukov, Phys. Rev. B **85**, 144527 (2012).
[50] W. Hanke, C. Platt, and R. Thomale, Ann. Phys. (Berlin) **523**, 638 (2011).
[51] C. H. Lee *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **106**, 067003 (2011).
[52] M. Kimata *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **107**, 166402 (2011).
[53] Z. P. Yin, K. Haule, and G. Kotliar, Nature Materials **10**, 932 (2011).
[54] S. Backes, D. Guterding, H. O. Jeschke, and R. Valent, New Journal of Physics **16**, 083025 (2014).
[55] L. A. Wray *et al.*, Phys. Rev. B **86**, 144515 (2012).
[56] D. Fang *et al.*, Phys. Rev. B **92**, 144513 (2015).
[57] P. S. Wang *et al.*, Phys. Rev. B **93**, 085129 (2016).
[58] T. Sato *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **103**, 047002 (2009).
[59] T. Terashima *et al.*, Journal of the Physical Society of Japan **79**, 053702 (2010).
[60] N. Xu *et al.*, Phys. Rev. B **88**, 220508 (2013).
[61] S. N. Khan and D. D. Johnson, Phys. Rev. Lett. **112**, 156401 (2014).
[62] K. Suzuki, H. Usui, and K. Kuroki, Phys. Rev. B **84**, 144514 (2011).
[63] T. Böhm *et al.*, Phys. Rev. X **4**, 041046 (2014).
[64] T. Böhm *et al.*, in preparation.
[65] V. Mishra *et al.*, Phys. Rev. B **79**, 094512 (2009).
[66] W.-C. Lee, S.-C. Zhang, and C. Wu, Phys. Rev. Lett. **102**, 217002 (2009).
[67] C. Platt, R. Thomale, C. Honerkamp, S.-C. Zhang, and W. Hanke, Phys. Rev. B **85**, 180502 (2012).
[68] M. Khodas and A. V. Chubukov, Phys. Rev. Lett. **108**, 247003 (2012).
[69] S. Maiti and A. V. Chubukov, Phys. Rev. B **87**, 144511 (2013).
[70] K. Hashimoto *et al.*, Science **336**, 1554 (2012).
[71] X. Qiu *et al.*, Phys. Rev. X **2**, 011010 (2012).